



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M-13344-2025

Date of decision: 25th March, 2025

Gurpreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. J.S. Moudgil, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

Through the instant petition, prayer is made for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.323 dated 06.11.2024, under Sections 109, 333, 126(2), 118(1), 115(2), 191(3) and 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Bhawanigarh, District Sangrur.

2. The aforementioned FIR has been registered on the basis of statement got recorded by the complainant Gurjant Singh on 06.11.2024 alleging that on 04.11.2024, his father Karnail Singh had been admitted in hospital. In the evening time, he had gone to his house to bring meal for his father. As soon as he reached there, the accused Gurdit Singh tried to hit his motorcycle. The petitioner struck blows with hockey on the person of the complainant. Thereafter, petitioner along with co-accused had entered into his house while having weapons and had opened assault upon him. He sustained injuries as well as grievous injury on head and was rushed to hospital for treatment. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an



application for anticipatory bail which was dismissed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur vide order dated 24.02.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay of two days in registration of matter before the police. The injury which has been opined to be grievous in nature has not been attributed to him but to his brother i.e. co-accused. The co-accused Gurpreet Singh and Bhupinder Singh have been extended benefit of bail. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab that there are serious allegations against the petitioner as by forming membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof, he had caused injuries to the complainant. The injuries No.1 and 2 on the person of the complainant were declared to be grievous and as per the opinion of the doctor, the injuries so sustained were collectively dangerous to life. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for conducting thorough investigation in the matter. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserves to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The part attributed to the petitioner is that he had caused injuries with hockey on the person of the complainant. The injuries that have been opined to be grievous in nature have not been attributed to the



petitioner but to the co-accused. Given the nature of the allegations, this Court is of the opinion that pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail, subject to his surrender before the learned trial Court within a period of ten days from the date of passing of this order and on his surrender within that period, he shall be released on bail by the learned trial Court on furnishing bonds to its satisfaction and further subject to following conditions:-

(i) the petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and shall appear before the investigating officer/arresting officer as and when required.

(ii) he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer.

(iii) he shall not commit any similar offence while on bail.

7. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the jurisdictional Court shall be empowered to consider the application for cancellation, if any, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

8. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

25th March, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes / No*
2. *Whether reportable* : *Yes / No*